

Most of his patients are employees of the mining companies in the Pittsburgh area. They are what he calls his "paying" patients.

But House colleagues from neighboring areas say Doc Morgan's medical practice is his chief stock in trade as a politician and that more than half of the services dispensed from his clinic are "for free."

"I'll never willing cut my links with medicine," he says.

He says that he always wanted to be a doctor and that he has always been "fascinated" by snakes. He spent days walking the creek beds as a boy stick in hand flipping the things up on the bank to a chum carrying a gunny sack.

But to obtain a medical degree was a wrench for him and for the entire family. His father was dismissed from his job in the mines in 1927 because of his outspoken support of the United Mine Workers of America. The elder Morgan took a job in Detroit but the family remained in Pennsylvania—all but THOMAS.

He was graduated from Waynesburg College in 1930 and went on to Detroit College of Medicine and Surgery where he received a medical degree in 1933. He then specialized in surgery at Wayne University and Grace Hospital in Detroit.

House Members were glad Doc MORGAN was around that day in 1954 when pistol shots rang out in the House of Representatives and several Congressman fell wounded at the hands of Puerto Rican fanatics.

The Honorable Clarence Cannon

SPEECH

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened with the recent passing of the great chairman of our House Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON.

Critics of the congressional committee system would do well to ponder the outstanding performance of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. I know of no man who could have served more diligently or effectively, more objectively or more patriotically, as chairman of this committee than the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON of Missouri, who was one of the most distinguished products of the seniority system of our committee procedure. I should like to point out further that we are most fortunate to have succeeding the great CLARENCE CANNON, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON. I should like also to observe that I know of no other system which we could devise that would now place as chairman of our House Committee on Appropriations a more distinguished, consecrated, and able patriot than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON.]

I realize that we must in no way detract from the unique contribution of the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON in paying our eulogy to this great American, but I believe that one of the most effective tributes that could be paid to him would be again to emphasize how effectively the House Committee on Appropriations

operated under Mr. CANNON's leadership. I pay tribute to this gentleman from Missouri because of his effective and consecrated work as chairman of a powerful House committee.

I did not have the pleasure of knowing the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON in the warm personal relationship that was enjoyed by so many of his colleagues. I do, however, remember with deep appreciation the tremendous service he rendered his Nation, the courtly attitude he always expressed in dealing with his colleagues, and I, too, shall miss him.

The gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, expressed to me more than any other man in the House the "Character of the Happy Warrior" so beautifully expressed by William Wordsworth when he said:

Who, if he rise to station of command
Rises by open means, and there will stand
On honorable terms, or else retire,
And in himself possess his own desire;
Who comprehends his trust, and to the same

Keeps faithful with a singleness of aim;
And therefore does not stoop, nor lie in wait
For wealth or honors, or for worldly state,
Whom they must follow; on whose head
must fall,

Like showers of manna, if they come at all.
I express to Mr. CANNON's widow, and to the people of Missouri, my profound sympathy because of the passing of this illustrious and noble man.

That Horrendous Supreme Court Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the May 26, 1964, edition of the Richmond News-Leader, a large and progressive newspaper in Virginia. The editor, Mr. J. J. Kilpatrick, is one of the ablest and most noted writers in America.

The subject matter of this editorial is the recent Supreme Court ruling concerning the Prince Edward County schools, and I would like all to read it because it cites so pointedly the extent to which the court seems to have gone beyond its legal prerogatives in reaching this decision.

This decision must astonish all right-thinking Americans, whether they be from Virginia or any other State.

The editorial follows:

The Supreme Court of the United States, speaking through Mr. Justice Black, yesterday erected another of its milestone decisions—a milestone, that is, to the decay of the Constitution and to the arrogance of judges.

This latest chapter in the Prince Edward County case put squarely before the Court one of the most profound questions of constitutional law ever brought before our highest Tribunal. In its simplest terms, the question was whether the Federal courts have power to compel a local legislative body to levy taxes in order to perform a discre-

tionary act. This was a question that demanded full and serious exposition, for the question was founded on bedrock principles of American government—the principle, among others, that taxation without representation is tyranny.

The Court did not grapple with these principles at all. Mr. Justice Black's opinion amounts to no more than a bland assertion that of course the Federal courts are possessed of such power. "The district court may, if necessary to prevent further racial discrimination, require the supervisors to exercise the power that is theirs to levy taxes to raise funds adequate to reopen, operate, and maintain without racial discrimination a public school system in Prince Edward County like that operated in other counties in Virginia."

That is the heart of the opinion, wrapped up in a single easy sentence. The Court's seven-man majority did not spell out precisely how the district court is to accomplish this unprecedented step. "An order of this kind is within the Court's power." That was all the Court had to say.

The mind spins off in a dozen directions. The gist of the Court's opinion is that "the colored schoolchildren" of Prince Edward since 1959 have been denied the equal protection of the laws. This is because "Prince Edward children must go to a private school or none at all," while "all other Virginia children can go to a public school." But our own Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals has ruled that under the laws and constitution of Virginia, the State's system of public schools depends entirely upon local decisions. Within limits fixed by the State constitution, a county is free to operate no schools, some schools, or very elaborate schools. This is what our highest State court held in *Prince Edward County v. Griffin*, that in Virginia, the operation of local schools is a local responsibility. The U.S. Supreme Court, to the layman's bewilderment, said yesterday that "We accept this case as a definitive and authoritative holding of Virginia law, binding on us."

But the Prince Edward case is "unique." It has been characterized by "entirely too much deliberation and not enough speed." Despite the fact that the "colored children" of Prince Edward have not been denied one single benefit, opportunity, or advantage made available by the county to white children, in some fashion perceived only by the Supreme Court the colored children have been denied "equal protection." This is because they do not have public schools while all other counties do. But Prince Edward has no control over what all other counties do. That was the authoritative, definitive, and binding decision of the Virginia Supreme Court. One travels around in circles.

So District Judge Oren Lewis, who failed wretchedly in drafting an order in the first place, must now try again. He may "require the supervisors to exercise the power that is theirs to levy taxes." How much taxes? On what property or transactions? At what rate? If the supervisors refuse to levy taxes on their constituents against their will, are the supervisors to be imprisoned for contempt? If the supervisors resign, are new supervisors to be similarly jailed? Or suppose the supervisors, thus intimidated, levy appropriate taxes, and the resentful people of Prince Edward refuse to pay? To jail with them too?

Other questions come to mind. The supervisors, under this judgment, may be compelled to levy taxes sufficient to maintain a public school system "like that operated in other counties in Virginia." What other counties? Arlington? Fairfax? Henrico? Or at the other end of the economic scale, Tazewell, Scott, Buchanan? Total per pupil costs range from \$170 or \$180 in some parts of the State to \$400 or \$500 in others. In one recent year, Arlington appropriated in

A2854

local funds alone \$383 per child; Nansemond County appropriated \$37 per pupil only.

The amount of taxes to be levied is a function not only of the quality of school to be maintained, but also of the number of pupils to be educated, the ratio of teachers to pupils, the salaries to be paid, the frills to be provided. It would seem to us inescapable that Judge Lewis, explicitly or implicitly, must pass upon all of these things, thereby assuming the role not merely of Federal judge, but also of county supervisor, school board, and school superintendent. Who elected him to these offices?

With this decision, the American Republic glimpses what Jefferson feared—a dictatorship imposed by judicial oligarchy. If the Supreme Court may order a tax imposed for one purpose, it may order a tax imposed for any purpose. The principles of the Court's 1954 decision, limited at the outset to public schools, swiftly were extended to parks, playgrounds, swimming pools, libraries, bus terminals, and hospitals. Many Southern communities are hanging back from public housing projects, lest they wind up with integrated housing projects. Are we to understand that in such communities, Negro plaintiffs may now compel the levying of taxes to construct public housing facilities like those of Boston or New York?

Only once before in the Court's history has the Court attempted anything approaching this grasp for power. That was in a bond case, where certain constitutional principles of contract were involved in the payment of a nonrecurring fixed sum. Here the supervisors are ordered to levy an unspecified tax, for the indefinite future, to operate schools of undefined cost; under threat of imprisonment, they are ordered to perform a discretionary act contrary to the expressed wishes of their people. This was the milestone reached yesterday by the Court. It is a milestone that stands far down a darkening road.

Johnson and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, residents of the Atlanta metropolitan area were honored by the visit of President Johnson. Our city extended to the President an almost overwhelming welcome, with crowds estimated at one-half million people.

Quite naturally, this event generated a great deal of public discussion.

I offer for enclosure in the RECORD the comments of Ralph McGill and Eugene Patterson, publisher and editor, respectively, of the Atlanta Constitution:

JOHNSON AND THE PEOPLE

(By Ralph McGill)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It is quite possible that President Lyndon Johnson is closer to the American people than are the pundits and the voices of press and radio. There are those in the Capital City, used to the clean intellectual prose that was a part of the elegant, overall style of the late John Kennedy, who profess to find a high corn content in commentaries of L.B.J. This makes them wince.

But Mr. Johnson is not supposed to be another Kennedy. He is Lyndon Johnson, onetime schoolteacher, whose mother had a

total of \$25 when her husband died. He worked his way through the small, obscure, sun-baked Southwest State Teachers College. His accent "belongs to be" different. He is a direct man. He knows how to speak concisely, clearly, and persuasively. His phrases are not honed on a whetstone of classical Greek, Latin, and a familiarity with the poets. But, he communicates as did John Kennedy. The President may be at his very best in small groups, rather than in addressing vast audiences. But, he is by no means at a loss with either.

TRUMAN'S TASTE

There was objection, one may recall, to Mr. Truman's flat Missouri twang and, more especially, to his taste in sport shirts. The louder they were, the better. In fact, once Mr. Truman learned that the loud patterns annoyed the more effete, the more he sought for garish, clashing colors. Odious comparisons were made between his style and that of ebullient and dramatic F.D.R. When Mr. Truman called feuding groups together to knock heads, it was said by some he "demanded" the office. A critic said exactly this of L.B.J. when he got the railway unions and operators together in a last-ditch effort to avoid a strike and to save the processes of negotiation.

What we also have before us is an explanation of why there is quite a difference between the two parties—the Democratic and the Republican. There is, admittedly, no tie that binds Governor Rockefeller and Senator Goldwater. Harold Stassen and Richard M. Nixon have little in common. The Arizona redeemer has no philosophy to share with Henry Cabot Lodge.

There is, however, a very strong tie between the late John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson as there was between Harry S. Truman and Franklin D. Roosevelt. There is a thread of political principle, or philosophy, that reaches all the way up from Jefferson to Johnson. The President is carrying out principles expressed and delineated by Mr. Kennedy. They are principles that have evolved with the Nation itself. It is these principles that continue to hold the party of many minorities and differences together. A man from Hyannis Port and Harvard may believe in them as well as a man from Southwest Teachers College and Johnson City.

CIVIL RIGHTS

So, we find Mr. Johnson going along very well. The civil rights fight will hurt him some—but how could it be otherwise? Those who fight the bill aren't going anywhere. The Nation must treat all its citizens alike. It hasn't done so. Either American citizenship is commonly and equally held or it isn't. A President can't get really hurt standing for that principle. Some say they find it hard to "identify with him." This has been true of all Presidents . . . there always were those who didn't warm to them. It is difficult to follow a man like John F. Kennedy.

But, if we look back in history, we find that it was a country lawyer and soldier, Andrew Jackson, who reformed the bank, who brought Texas into the Union, who broke the theory of interposition and established the essential principles that the eloquent philosopher, Jefferson, had written into the Declaration of Independence. Performance counts most.

HE SETTLED RAILS—SO WHAT?

(By Eugene Patterson)

Lyndon Johnson is emphatically southern. He understates what he is, instead of posing as something more than he is. He retains his prairie talk in the presence of professors. He gloves his claws in courtesy but wears his feelings on his sleeve.

Closing a talk to editors in the White House rose garden, he waved his hand and said, "Come in the house."

The scene was Jacksonian. Marine musicians, who used to sit massed in the entrance hall playing chamber music, were dispersed in combos playing dance rhythms.

The President was quickly on the east room floor, dancing first with one editor's lady, then another. The Marines had to play "Good Night, Ladies" half a dozen times before the overstaying guests made for the door.

During the dancing some women wept, remembering John F. Kennedy and his austere entertainments. They were stiff functions, and crowds representing cross sections of America were made a little uneasy by the formality, but they also were impressive by their majesty, and besides, many loved Mr. Kennedy fiercely.

Mr. Johnson's old-shoe use of the White House made a clashing contrast and some criticized him. But the thoughtful ones gave Mr. Johnson credit due.

He, more than anyone else, knew unfavorable comparisons might be drawn. But he was honest enough to be himself anyway. He knew that any effort by him to pretend to the elegance of Mr. Kennedy would be hollow. As he said on the night he became President, he will do the best he can for that is all he can do. He has the honesty to be himself. Until the value of this fact registers on many otherwise sophisticated Americans, he is going to be resented and hooted at.

Lyndon Johnson is a President southerners can understand instinctively. They know the power and the judgment that can reside behind the homely front. But other Americans are having to work at it to understand this man and his unfamiliar ways. There is not entirely a prejudice against the southern manner, but some of that is present, even if unintentionally. The President must have the help of his fellow southerners if he is to succeed in reestablishing national faith in southern leadership that existed in the founding days of the Republic.

If his native region is the very one to undercut or lowrate his aims and intentions, he will be crippled in his historic efforts to regain understanding of the South's leadership worth, and of his own.

Eventually results will speak for themselves. The President engineered a rail strike settlement by leadership methods without modern parallel. This remarkable success, and others that may come, can create an appreciation and a trust after awhile.

But right now President Johnson especially needs, beyond all party argument, the hand of his own region's people. He is deeply troubled by the misunderstandings he is encountering. He needs the South's help because he—a southerner—is embarked on nothing less than a missionary effort to reunite the land in all its parts and peoples. He is better equipped for it than Tennessee's Andrew Johnson was in his day. The question facing the southern people is whether we are.

Allies' Cuban Sales May Be Expensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the continuing problems that beset us in our relationship with

1964

Cuba, and daily recognize the "head in the sand" attitude of the administration on this question.

Recently, it has become evident that the administration is making moves, seemingly to halt the flow of our allies' support of the Castro government and the ineffectiveness of these moves is evident.

Columnist Elliot Janeway, featured in this morning's Chicago Tribune, emphasizes the economic problem facing the Castro machine in an article which dramatizes the potential for removal of Communist control of Cuba if we had a foreign policy that was determined to produce this.

The article follows:

JANEWAY'S VIEW: ALLIES' CUBAN SALES MAY BE EXPENSIVE
(By Elliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, May 26.—The price of sugar has dropped again. With the world economy booming, and with other commodity prices rising in response to strengthened demand, the sugar market is nevertheless a shambles. This is of interest to others than housewives and manufacturers of candy bars and soft drinks. Common prudence dictates that it should be of interest to our various allies who have been asserting so vigorously their right to do business with Castro's Cuba.

For Cuba is a one-crop economy, and her credit is tied to the price of sugar. What Cuba needs to buy are manufactured products, particularly expensive heavy equipment like the big buses the British have just sold her. The only way they and our other allies can crack whatever market Cuba offers is by shipping on credit—long-term credit.

As a practical matter, this means that the countries selling to Cuba are paying out cash for the raw materials they must import, for the labor they must hire to fabricate goods, and for the shipping and insurance they must buy each time they deliver a product.

ACCEPT NOTES IN RETURN

In return, they are accepting IOU's. That is, they are paying out their own cash for the privilege of buying a raffle ticket on Cuba's future stability—a raffle ticket, moreover, that may cost them millions of dollars. Each time the price of sugar wobbles or sinks, this looks like a chancier bet.

Cuba, of course, all along has had some cash, and still has. Trouble is, she isn't using it to pay for the hard industrial goods which her economy needs so desperately (and which the U.S. Government and U.S. business were installing there before Castro took over).

The import of the wherewithal for industrial development does not claim a priority on Cuba's cash, but the export of political trouble does. One million dollars a month to buy the Chilean election for the Communists plus whatever it took to bring Brazil to the verge of revolution and Panama to mob rule in the streets—or even to send a bearded military adviser or two to far-off Zanzibar—for this Cuba can pay cash. And so she will continue to spend her cash on the export of violence as long as our allies bank her.

NOT MUCH EFFORT MADE

World politics being world politics, many a foreign politician in even the friendliest countries can get good mileage out of telling the United States to mind its own business. This is the story of the argument over the right of Europe and Canada to sell to Cuba.

The fact of the matter is that we haven't put any muscle into an effort to stop this.

All that we've done has been to advise our good friends that they may be throwing good money after bad.

They may begin to figure this out for themselves as the price of sugar drops; as Italy is forced to reborrow dollars after she's dug herself into a hole by just such self-defeating finance; and as the West Germans warn the British to stop doing it while there's still time to avoid trouble. A Cuba at war with her natural U.S. market and with the democratic ideal of the hemisphere cannot be a good credit risk.

The Mythical Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the American people to take note of the reason why the debate is extending so long on the civil rights bill. It is not that reasonable men cannot agree on a reasonable course of action to correct known injustices. It is simply that we are debating two different bills at the same time—the actual civil rights bill, passed by the House by a very substantial margin of Democrats and Republicans, and the mythical civil rights bill, conjured up by elements in our society wishing to preserve the status quo, however unjust.

Recently the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an editorial distinguishing how the actual and mythical bills differ in 12 important respects. The editorial was read by William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, Ariz., and he in turn published an editorial on May 21, 1964, agreeing in all respects with the Post's points but expressing some concern over one particular provision of the bill as it passed the House.

I found this analysis illuminating and wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues. The Arizona Daily Star editorial follows:

CORRECTING THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Under the title of "The Mythical Rights Bill," the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an illuminating editorial on the civil rights bill now before the Senate. It is illuminating, because it not only explodes numerous myths about what is in the bill, and is not in the bill, but astonishingly condones a provision in it that forbids American citizens from "threatening or coercing others to disobey the law." It makes little of this provision in the following words, "which is a far cry from the denial of free speech and press."

The Star thinks differently, although it approves of all of the points as explained by the Post-Dispatch, from No. 1 to, but not including, No. 12. This offending provision would forbid the very civil rights demonstrations that are being carried on today by Negroes all over the country.

The purpose of civil rights demonstrations is to threaten and coerce. Indeed, the freedom to threaten and coerce are civil rights that have been practiced by Americans since the Boston Tea Party down to the time of the Volstead Act and much other legislation.

Those forms of criticism go on constantly in a wide variety of ways. If such a prohibition is legal in the civil rights bill, it can be made legal in all other legislation.

It is a denial of free speech, and the right "peacefully to assemble" which the Constitution guarantees every American. It makes no sense to grant Negroes and others the same civil rights that all Americans should enjoy, and then in such legislation forbid the right to "threaten and coerce." This present bill would not be before Congress. It would not have passed the House, unless Negroes; in their programs of civil disobedience, had threatened and coerced. Indeed, it will take some more of their threats and coercion to get the present bill through the Senate.

The Post-Dispatch's editorial follows:

"As the Senate's civil rights debate goes into its 10th week, it is obvious that supporters and opponents of the rights bill are not talking about the same kind of bill at all.

"Proponents are discussing the bill actually before the Senate. The opponents, for purposes of fright propaganda, have in effect drafted a mythical bill that they oppose. It has the following provisions:

"1. The Federal Government and not the States will now fix voting qualifications. (The real bill only says States cannot enforce racial discrimination against voters.)

"2. Public schools must be brought into a racial balance. (The real bill specifically rejects that idea.)

"3. Employers must hire from minority groups by quotas. (The real bill only says an employer cannot refuse to hire an applicant solely because of his race or religion.)

"4. The Federal Government can deny aid to any State that affronts the purpose of the bill. (The actual bill permits denial of aid to projects—not to States—that create racial discrimination.)

"5. Hotel, restaurant, and entertainment operators must admit any ill-behaved, ill-dressed citizen who seeks entrance. (Nonsense; the bill only says the operators cannot refuse entrance solely because of race or religion.)

"6. The Government is authorized to tell homeowners to whom they must sell their homes. (The bill does not even discuss such housing matters.)

"7. Private clubs must admit Negroes (or Mexicans, Catholics, Protestants, Indians, Jews, etc.). (The actual bill exempts private clubs.)

"8. The Attorney General will be a dictator. (The bill allows him to go to court to seek enforcement of the law.)

"9. Well, then, Federal judges will be dictators. (They are empowered to issue injunctions to enforce the law, which is hardly unusual.)

"10. Jury trial will be denied in rights cases. (The issue does not come up in the present bill, since it provides only for civil actions. Jury trial is not today required even for criminal contempt cases, but the bill may be amended to permit it.)

"11. Enforcement of the rights bill requires Federal police everywhere. (The bill requires no police anywhere; largely, it leaves enforcement up to court action by those aggrieved.)

"12. It shall be illegal to discuss segregation, or to express discriminatory thoughts. (The bill prohibits anyone from threatening or coercing others to disobey the law, which is a far cry from denial of free speech and press.)

"In short, the whole picture of the rights bill drawn by southern propagandists is one of a terrible tyranny being forced upon a majority of Americans in the name of a minority. We are asked to believe that this is the sort of horrendous plot for which the House voted by an overwhelming 290 to 130. How silly can propagandists get?

"The answer to that question seems to be that they will be as silly as necessary to avoid any honest discussion of the facts of the civil rights case. Fearing facts, they insist upon constant repetition of hokum. That is the content of their mythical bill."

Stage-Managed Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press story which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of May 26 should arouse more than casual interest from the American people. It appears the administration is carefully staging the visits of the President and the First Lady to so-called poverty areas. The Associated Press story reveals the William David Marlow family of Rocky Mount, N.C., are a little put out at the whole business. They did not even know they were poverty stricken until the President told them.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some limit to the extent the campaign to win votes is carried. At the very least, responsible politicians should respect the dignity and intelligence of the people. Holding some of our citizens up to ridicule, causing ill feeling among their neighbors, and using stage tricks to improve the story is not worthy of the office of President of the United States. Surely, if such performances are required to sell the Johnson poverty program, the whole project is open to suspicion.

The Associated Press story on the Marlow family follows:

MADE TO LOOK POOR, FARM FAMILY SAYS—INSTRUCTIONS FOR JOHNSON VISIT TOLD BY WIFE

ROCKY MOUNT, N.C., May 26.—The William David Marlow family has had hardly a minute to itself since President Johnson dropped in by helicopter for a visit May 7.

"We've been talked at, talked to, talked about, and thrown off on (criticized)," said Mrs. Marlow, 40, a sharecropper's wife with sun-bleached hair and strong features.

"There's been about as much excitement since he left as while he was here," she added, recalling what has happened since Johnson's visit.

DEPENDS ON CROPS

Hundreds of persons have driven past their door, she said, and many have come at night to shine their lights on the house to see what it looks like.

Mrs. Marlow said some of the neighbors have appeared jealous of the attention received by the family, which lives 2 miles south of Rocky Mount and depends on tobacco and cotton for a living.

"But we didn't invite the President," she said. "He invited himself."

Cars came by all afternoon and night after the President left, she said. The next day, the children counted 146 carloads of people. Some stopped to talk.

A \$4,000 INCOME EXPECTED

"We've missed several days' work and don't expect to get one thing out of it," Mrs. Marlow said. "I've burned my husband's lunch

three times while I was answering questions," she added. "He's getting pretty ill about it."

Marlow said he expects to gross about \$4,000 from his 9 acres of tobacco and 1½ acres of cotton this year and perhaps have \$1,500 clear with which to start the next year.

This would be much more than the \$1,500 the President suggested during their conversation. Johnson apparently thought that would be the total for the year before living expenses were subtracted.

Mrs. Marlow said: "We didn't even feel like we were in poverty. We thought we were on our feet for the first time in 4 years. And along come the word that we're the poorest folks in the country."

PLENTY OF LOVING

Mrs. Marlow said her five children "have always had plenty to eat and plenty of loving. We're a close-knit group."

Pointing to a newspaper picture of Dr. George Smith, associate director of the North Carolina Extension Service, Mrs. Marlow said, "The Governor's man tried to make us look poorer than we are."

She said Smith "told me to be sure and have a washing on the line when the President came and also be sure the children were barefoot when the President arrived."

In Raleigh, Smith said he did not intend to make the Marlows look any better or any worse but to make them appear homey. He said the President wanted the Marlows "to act natural."

Mrs. Davis Grant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 27, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Friday, May 15, issue of the Austin Statesman, Austin, Tex., carried an article which was of personal interest to me in view of the fact of my close personal relationship with the entire family. The article which I will include at the close of these remarks deals with the graduation of Mrs. Davis Grant, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Bassett J. Orr, of Bryan, Tex. Mr. Davis Grant is the General Counsel for the Texas Bar Association, and was formerly employed on a special subcommittee here in the U.S. Congress engaged in investigative work.

I take pleasure in saluting Mrs. Grant and extending my congratulations to her.

"MRS. AUSTIN" DUE DEGREE—KEEPING PROMISE

(By Anita Brewer)

Ann Grant was "Mrs. Austin" in 1958 because she could cook liver and onions so well, iron a man's shirt to perfection, and looked like a million dollars.

When she won the title, someone asked her what were her plans for the future.

"I'd like to go back to the University of Texas and earn my degree," she answered.

On May 30 before the President of the United States and her husband and five children, the degree will be awarded to Mrs. Grant. It will represent many nights of burning midnight oil, many suppers cooked by her husband—Davis Grant, general counsel for the State bar of Texas, and many dresses and blue jeans ironed by her daughters.

Her degree is in elementary education with

emphasis on speech therapy, and she has some more plans now for the future: She will teach next fall in the Austin public schools, at Highland Park School around the corner from the Grant home at 3311 Big Bend.

While Mrs. Grant has been going to school, the children have learned to be independent—and even to handle emergencies. Just last week, 8-year-old Richard and 10-year-old John were home alone one afternoon after school. Richard fell, cut his chin and chipped a tooth.

John said, "Now lie still and bleed quietly. I'll get help."

And he did—good help. He got M. K. Hage, Jr., principal of Highland Park School. Everything was all right in no time.

Both 14-year-old Kathy and 12-year-old Melissa know how to sew, iron, and cook—because they have had to help their mother. As a result, they always are well groomed and they will be even when their mother isn't there to check up on their hair and fingernails.

Davis, the 16-year-old, is an independent self-starter also. He is in the 10th grade at McCallum High School and works 3 afternoons a week at Handy Andy.

All year—in fact for the 3 years Mrs. Grant has been going to school—things around 3311 Big Bend become mighty quiet about 8:30 p.m. That's when everybody starts studying.

While Mrs. Grant has enjoyed her class-work and the inspiration of going to school, she warns her daughters that she did it the wrong way.

"I'm all for a girl getting her education before marriage and five children," she says. "But it can be done either way."

She looks forward to teaching.

"I've always wanted to be a teacher," she says, "and for 15 years I operated a kindergarten and first grade. But I'm really looking forward to the future."

Another happy event is due soon for the Grants. Mrs. Grant's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bassett Orr, will be returning in a few weeks from Uganda where Orr has been stationed with the Agency for International Development—but not soon enough to see their daughter graduate.

Negro Leader Warns of Demonstration Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a prominent Negro, retired Army Maj. Hughes Alonzo Robinson, has spoken out on the subject of racial demonstrations and their ultimate effect on his race. Because his forthright views are of interest to the House, I include the following article written by Major Robinson which first appeared in the Albany, Ga., Herald:

NEGRO LEADER WARNS OF DEMONSTRATION COSTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article, written by a Negro, appeared in the February 6 issue of the Albany (Ga.) Herald. Maj. Hughes Alonzo Robinson, a prominent government and military figure who now makes his home in Fort Valley, Ga., is a retired Army officer, educator, and industrial executive. Feeling that his people were being led